

CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (Bar No. 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
BAS DE BLANK (Bar No. 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
ALYSSA CARIDIS (Bar No. 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
EVAN D. BREWER (Bar No. 304411)  
ebrewer@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: (415) 773-5700  
Facsimile: (415) 773-5759

SEAN M. SULLIVAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
COLE RICHTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: (312) 754-0002  
Facsimile: (312) 754-0003

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

GOOGLE LLC,  
  
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,  
  
v.  
  
SONOS, INC.,  
  
Defendant and Counterclaimant

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA

**UNOPPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION REQUESTING SUBSEQUENT  
CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Pursuant to Northern District of California Local Rules 7-11 and 16-10(c), Sonos, Inc. files this administrative motion requesting a subsequent case management conference to discuss issues relating to the upcoming patent showdown procedure. Google LLC has indicated that it does not oppose this motion.

On October 8, 2021, the Court entered a Patent Showdown Scheduling Order. Dkt. 68. That Order (1) required each party to “select and exchange one asserted claim” for the showdown procedure, ¶ 1, and (2) noted that if summary judgment fails to resolve the parties’ dispute over the selected claims, “counsel should be prepared for a prompt trial on the remaining issues”, ¶ 9.

The parties are working through the Court’s summary judgement showdown procedure and planning for a potential showdown trial. The parties have conducted several meet-and-confers discussing proposed schedules for pre-trial exchanges and the scope of the showdown trial.

Two issues arose during those meet-and-confers for which the parties could use the Court’s guidance. The first relates to scheduling. If the Court could provide additional guidance on when it would expect to conduct a patent showdown trial (if one is necessary), then the parties would be able to work backwards to set a schedule for pre-trial exchanges (e.g., exchange of expert reports and briefing schedule for *Daubert* motions). The second relates to the scope of the showdown procedure. While the Court’s scheduling order required Sonos to elect only a single asserted claim for the showdown procedure, it did not place any limits on Google on the number of prior art grounds it can assert.

Sonos requests that the Court schedule a further case management conference pursuant to Local Rule 16-10(c) to discuss these issues. The parties would more fully state their positions in the requisite case management statement to be filed beforehand.

Dated: April 13, 2022

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
and  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

By: /s/ Alyssa Caridis  
Alyssa Caridis

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*